

A
L E T T E R

T O A

F R I E N D,

O N T H E

L A T E R E V O L U T I O N

I N

F R A N C E.

1791.



This confidential Letter was written at the desire of a Friend, whose avocations and want of knowledge of the French tongue deprived him of those Sources, from which due information was to be procured. Several persons, more from partiality for the writer, than merit in the work, having requested copies of it, has been the cause of its appearing in print. Neither vanity or lucre has been the least object. To avoid both, he has neither subscribed his name to it, nor offers it to sale.

E R R A T A.

Page 8. Note, for 11th century read 14th century.
p. 9. flushed r. fleshed. p. 27. unbottomed r. unbuttoned.
p. 46. Ramboillet r. Rambouillet. p. 52. grenadier r.
grenadiers. p. 55. Note, accident r. incident. p. 67. r.
old maids. p. 68. Higgin's r. Higgon's. St. Maurs r.
St. Maur. p. 72. Note, dele then.

These, and any other mistakes which have been com-
mitted by the errors of the press, the reader is desired to
correct with his pen.



A L E T T E R

F R I E N D, &c.

DEAR SIR,

YOU have been pleased to ask my opinion concerning the astonishing change of measures, which has lately taken place in a neighbouring kingdom; I readily assure you that an alteration in the system of government, in other words, a revolution in France appears to me to have been undoubtedly necessary. The deranged state of the finances, verging rapidly towards a national bankruptcy, and the oppressions of the people called loudly for it. It was the wish of every Frenchman, if we except possibly the courtiers who, as in most countries, are generally enriched at the expence of the public. Wherefore I perfectly agree with Mr.

B

Painé,

Paine, that the ideas of liberty have taken such deep root in the breasts of the people, that it is ridiculous to suppose that a counter-revolution can happen: I mean that they will ever suffer themselves again to be reduced to the slavish state of their former government. We differ then only as to the mode and progress of this revolution. The advantages, which may possibly accrue from it hereafter, time alone can show.

No man in France more ardently wished to redress all grievances, and particularly the derangement of the finances, than the king himself. Mr. Paine allows him to be a good man, and on that account beloved by the nation. His Majesty lamented the ambition of Lewis XIV. and the voluptuousness of his grandfather, to which, with great probability, I may add the fatal alliance which he formed with America: for all these contributed to the ruin of the nation.

For this purpose he frequently conferred with his ministers. Perceiving however that no redress could be obtained from their counsels, he recalled the parliaments, which his grandfather had dissolved. He consulted them. He requested their advice. But they, more studious to establish their own consequence, than

than to attend to the public weal, offered no hints, no schemes towards the completion of an object of such magnitude and importance. Wherefore his Majesty, thus baffled in his good intentions, was resolved to assemble the nobility and dignified clergy by their representatives in the same manner as Henry IV. one of his predecessors, had heretofore done. These were styled the *Notables*.

The Parliament, sensible that such a step would totally annihilate their own importance, opposed the measure as much as possible, and gave the King to understand that the votes of such an assembly, particularly upon the subject of taxation, would be incompetent without the concurrence of the third estate, supposing that he would never adopt a measure, which would in the end infallibly circumscribe his own power. They were however mistaken. His Majesty was determined to rescue the people from national disgrace, from oppression and from misery. He had pledged his word, and was resolved to keep it.

The idea of a national bankruptcy terrified no set of men so much as those who had lent their money upon the security of the public funds. As long as they had received their interest with punctuality, they exhibited no symp-

toms of complaint against arbitrary power, or the despotism of the state. But when government became slack in the payment of their dividends; when the embarrassment of the treasury to make them good was visible, these men became the most zealous patriots, the professed advocates for liberty.

At this moment Mr. Necker was minister of the finances. When he came into office it was easy for him to foresee that a revolution was at hand. Many things had contributed towards it, and, as Mr. Paine observes, the intercourse with America was not the * least. Mr. Necker therefore was resolved to have the merit of it. It was his interest to gain the stock-jobbers, and through them the people. To the former he promised security for their money. To the latter he held forth the cap of liberty and freedom. Even in the assembly itself he became a necessary man, no member being supposed equally capable of that branch of legislation. It was for these reasons that all parties joined in procuring his recall after the King had dismissed him. But when the stock-jobbers perceived that from finance, he attended to politics, they turned their backs upon him, as they did afterwards upon the A-

* Modern philosophy comes in for a great share.

sembly,

sembly, when they ceased to pursue the grand object they had at heart. What was it to them if the constitution was good, or bad, provided their dividends were paid, and their capital secured? Thus we see for what reason Mr. Necker courted the stock-jobbers, and the stock-jobbers supported the minister, and stirred up the people against the lawful authority of the King. He was resolved, as I said, to have the merit of the revolution, which was then in embryo. But there were other men equally ambitious of that honor, and therefore, when he had served their purposes, they turned their backs upon him also.

The King had dismissed him, because his calculations towards removing the national grievance were deficient. The stock-jobbers and the people however forced his Majesty to recal him, and at his return he was received as the tutelar angel of France. When the Assembly had got all the powers of government into their own hands, they called upon him to produce his budget. Finding it impossible to answer their expectations, and seeing his popularity on the wane, he very prudently withdrew to his estate in Switzerland. The day of his return, I should have remarked, was ordained *for ever* to be kept a festival.

But

But both the minister and the festival are now forgotten. *Sic transit gloria mundi!*

His Majesty might have had another motive for dismissing his minister. It is not improbable that he received some information of his sinister dealings with the stock-jobbers and the people. Be that as it may, the dismissal caused a general alarm. The press began to teem with the most incendiary and defamatory pamphlets. Gazettes and news-papers sprung up like mushrooms, replete with the most inflammable and combustible materials. The people in Paris were in a state of the most alarming commotion. Meetings were held all over the city, and in particular at the *Palais-royale* (the residence of the Duke of Orleans) whereat every black and atrocious deed was hatched, and from thence issued. All was now uproar and confusion. We need only call to mind the calamitous scene exhibited in London in the year 1780 to form some idea of the present moment in Paris, where the minds of the people, if possible, are more degraded and debased.

It was the dread of these mobs, which deterred the Kings of France from making Paris their place of residence. To guard against this rising evil, an army was ordered to assemble round

round the skirts of the city. The motives for this measure are variously related. I will give you both sides of the question, and you will then judge for yourself. Mr. Paine affirms, with the popular party, that it was assembled with the view of cashiering the members of the National Assembly, who were then sitting at Versailles. The people were likewise made to believe that the army was to reduce the city to ashes, and to massacre all the inhabitants. If I may hazard a conjecture, it seems more probable that the King was advised to the measure for his own security, as also for that of the people and the capital. The army was to intimidate, and not to act offensively, otherwise M. Broglio, one of the most experienced generals of the age, would certainly have made a different disposition of it to what he did. If however the view of the court was ever so pure, their policy was very defective. It served only to confirm the people in the ideas they had formed of the despotism of the state, and consequently augmented their fury and resentment. By the easy communication they had with the army, and their frequent intercourse with the soldiers, they soon debauched them from their duty by dint of money, and specious arguments in favor of liberty.

From

From eight to ten thousand of the rabble now began to parade the streets of Paris, and indiscriminately to plunder the shops, houses and convents. They seized upon the hospital for invalid soldiers, where they met with no resistance, and furnished themselves with some thousands of musquets, and several pieces of cannon. From thence they repaired to the Arsenal, which they plundered also, and marched directly for the Bastile*. On this subject likewise there is a difference of opinion. The popular party, to palliate their savage cruelty towards M. Launey, the governor, gave out that he was punished solely for his treachery. This report I shall not pretend to confute, as Mr. Paine takes no notice of it, and therefore must suppose it void of credit. The opposite party affirm, that his only fault was that of submitting to a parley with the insurgents, when he should have drawn up the bridges, and retired within the works. Had he done this, they say, he might have bid defiance to the mob, without firing a single gun, which he never did. Be that as it may, the mob seized him, and chopped off his head, without either

* The Bastile was a fortress, like our Tower in London. It was built in the 11th century, for the defence of Paris against the English.

judge or jury, paraded it through the streets, and afterwards stuck it up as a trophy before the *Palais-Royal*.

Like hounds just flushed (if I may use the expression) these inhuman wretches thirsted after more blood and carnage. Fury and madness seemed to mark all their steps. The Court became terrified, and dismayed, as well they might. The Assembly, taking advantage of their consternation, artfully seized that moment to propose to the king that the troops might be withdrawn. To refuse, would be to confirm the suspicions of the people. The army, or at least what was left of it, was not to be relied upon. The crown, and possibly the life of the king, depended upon the answer. His majesty therefore hesitated not a moment. He declared that he would not only give orders for the army to retire, but would, such was his confidence in the people, go to Paris the next day unattended and without guards, and endeavour to settle every thing they could wish or expect from him.

This generous deportment of the king disconcerted the views of designing men. They were fearful that the confidence which he seemed to place in the people might revive their loyalty and affections. To counteract

C

this,

this, engrossed all their attention. Their fears however were groundless. They had learnt their lessons. The emissaries of the *Palais-Royale* had been both active and able instructors. They had taught them to believe that the king put himself into their hands through absolute necessity, therefore they were to attribute nothing to the generous confidence of the monarch; for, in fact, it was only a tacit acknowledgment of his own defeat. In a word, he could not do otherwise.

The next day however Lewis XVI. faithful to his engagement, set off from Versailles without a guard. When he arrived in Paris, though surrounded by an immense mob, he heard, not as heretofore, a single huzza, or shout of *God save the king*, except from a venerable old man who, I suppose, could not divest himself of an old custom, which was now going out of fashion. Had he not been rescued at the moment, he would have been torn to pieces by the mob for this slight tribute of loyalty. This anecdote I had from an eyewitness. The king, although he had every reason to fear for his life, (for a woman was killed by a musket-ball not far from his person, which shot was undoubtedly intended for him) appeared composed and undaunted. He bore
up

up against this disgraceful and dangerous day with a courage which reflected the greatest lustre on the fortitude of his heart, and the elevation of his mind.

On his arrival at the Town-house, he confirmed the nomination of the people in favor of Messrs. Bailly and La Fayette. As the former appears to be a very singular character, it may not be amiss to give you a little sketch of it. He is a member of the Academy of Sciences, and has published some treatises on astronomy. That a man of his cast of mind, given to such abstruse studies, should quit his peaceable desk for the tumult and uproar of popular commotion appears very singular indeed! This singularity of conduct however was surpassed by his boldness and effrontery to the king upon the present occasion. After decorating his majesty's hat with the national cockade, which undoubtedly was a pointed insult, as it was the very badge and ensign of rebellion at that moment, he presented the keys of the city to him, (for you will be pleased to observe he was then Mayor of Paris) and addressed his sovereign as follows: "Sire, these are the same keys which were presented to your ancestor, Henry IV. when he had subdued his people. Now the peo-

"ple present them to you, after having conquered their king."

His majesty having suffered every thing that could gall and mortify him, was permitted to return to Versailles. The queen awaited his arrival with the most impatient anxiety. When she saw him approach, she ran to meet him, and fainted away at his feet. From this incident we may easily form a judgment of the distressed feelings of this unfortunate Princess, and be apt to drop a tear of pity and compassion on her sufferings.

Though the cruel, and indeed scandalous behaviour of the Parisians had rent the king's heart with the most pungent grief, yet the demonstrations of joy which the people of Versailles testified upon his safe return, afforded some consolation to the much injured monarch. Here he might have remained in peace, if the iniquitous measures of the cabal would have suffered it. But it was only in troubled waters they could fish with any prospect of success; it was from anarchy and confusion alone they could expect to bring their vile projects to bear. If his popularity increased, they knew full well that their influence must decline. To counteract this, they bent all their force. They were resolved to terrify

terrify the people into their measures, a manœuvre which they have always employed to this day, and, I am sorry to add, with success. For this purpose it was buzzed in their ears that plots were hatching, and armies collecting in favour of despotism and arbitrary power. It was also artfully and industriously insinuated that no confidence could be placed in the king, who most assuredly would listen to the pernicious counsels of his ministers and courtiers, and adopt every measure towards the extinction of liberty.

These reports had their effect. Add to which the high price of grain, for the year 1789 had been very unproductive, revived the former discontents of the people, which had subsided a little after his majesty's gracious and passive deportment in Paris. The real scarcity of that necessary article of life however was not sufficient of itself to accomplish their designs; for though it was dear, there was always a supply. The cabal therefore was obliged to have recourse to their old tricks, and as there was no prospect of a real famine, they resolved to create such a one in appearance as would answer their purposes. Of this I shall speak more at large hereafter, and in the mean time only observe that these reports to discredit

dit the king's intentions soon roused the people to action. They began to relent that they had suffered him to depart, and were resolved to bring him back again to the capital. The Marquis de St. Heuregues, a seditious fire-brand, attempted it at the head of 15 or 16 hundred of the rabble, who, like himself, were ready for any bloody deed and atrocious act. But M. de Fayette opposed him with a body of the militia, reserving that honor to himself on a future day.

The artificial scarcity of bread-corn gave a very favourable opportunity to those who wished to rid themselves of their opponents. Every man they sought to destroy was marked as a *monopolizer*, the sure badge of proscription at that moment, as the epithet *aristocrate* has since been. The first who was accused of monopoly was a M. de Fleffelles. An anonymous, and more probably a forged letter was all the proof produced against him. This was sufficient for the rabble. They dragged him in consequence to the Town-house, and demanded immediate justice. The magistrates, who since the revolution had seized upon the administration of the police, seeming dilatory in pronouncing judgment upon him, the mob rushed in, seized their victim, and tore him to
pieces

pieces in a moment, carrying his mangled carcass in bloody triumph through the streets.

Messrs. Foulon and Berthier were the next objects of their misguided fury. The former had been Comptroller of the Finances, the other Mayor of Paris. The first was accused of having used some harsh and imprudent expressions reflecting on the people. Possibly moved to indignation in seeing their excesses on the supposed and artificial scarcity of bread, he said that if they were obliged to eat straw, they would deserve it. But the real cause of their displeasure, or rather of the displeasure of those who had the direction of their motions, was his intended appointment to succeed M. Necker as minister, whom, like the ark of the covenant, none dared to approach with impunity. In their refined cruelty towards this unfortunate Gentleman, they affected to make him undergo the same sufferings as were inflicted on Jesus Christ. They crowned him with thorns, and when fainting and sinking under their barbarous and cruel hands, they brought him vinegar to drink. Then they struck off his head, which they fixed upon a pole, and carried it in procession through the streets, with a wisp of straw stuffed into the lifeless mouth.

M. Ber-

M. Berthier, his son-in-law, had been forcibly dragged by another division of the mob from his country-house. The two parties met, and they had the inhumanity and unparalleled barbarity to force him to kiss the bloody and mangled head of his near relation. Then, after repeated insults, he underwent the same fate. A soldier immediately tore out his heart, and presented it, still beating and convulsive, to Messrs. de La Fayette and Bailly. These outrages however on human nature were certainly perpetrated by a lawless mob, by a furious and desperate rabble. In this I agree with Mr. Paine; and it would be as unjust to condemn the nation at large for their excesses, as to make a man in a raging fever responsible for his actions. The censure therefore lies at the door of those who gave these bloody hints to a blind and misguided mob; it affects those who did not make use of their power and authority to restrain those deeds of horror and atrocity. In this light can we acquit the National Assembly? Most certainly we cannot; especially when we reflect that a majority of the House rejected the proposals of Messrs. Mounier and Lally-Tollendal, with some others, for preserving the peace of the capital, and preventing in future
such

such acts of violence and blood-shed. M. Bornave in particular, the disciple of M. Mirabeau, had the assurance to applaud those excesses. "After all," said he, "is the blood that has been spilt of such mighty consequence?" Mr. Paine remarks that the people (speaking of these bloody deeds) learn to copy after their betters. He might have remarked likewise that they knew how to profit by their instructions.

The motion, which was made for the re-establishment of order, for the maintenance of the peace and the security of the capital, being rejected, several members quitted the Assembly. They acted with proper precaution, for every dissenting voice was liable to proscription. He was an *Aristocrate*, consequently an enemy to liberty. To keep up the alarm, which as I observed before was the main policy of the Demagogues, M. Mirabeau informed the House, with the most serious and sorrowful countenance, that he had reason to suspect that gun-power and other combustibles were laid beneath it to blow them all up at once. Search was immediately made, but no discovery of the kind ensued. Nevertheless these reports had also their effect. The provinces being alarmed at these tales, began

to arm in their own defence, expecting every moment that attacks would be made against their newly-acquired liberty, which they were made to believe would be overthrown by the aristocratic party. Upon this, they gave unlimited powers to their representatives, who failed not to turn them to their own advantage. From hence, every violent act, every unjust measure adopted by the Assembly, became an act of the nation. The powers which the constituents gave to their representatives at the first outset, were very limited, and moderate. They wished indeed for liberty, but it was rational liberty alone they sought. They had given the most positive and peremptory order to their representatives to co-operate with the Monarch in every thing in procuring it. They were deputed to form a constitution, and set such bounds to the powers of the crown, as would preserve a due equilibrium in the state. As a model, they looked up to this country, though they certainly aimed to improve upon it. Originals are susceptible of improvement, as times and circumstances alter. But now all these moderate views were laid aside through terror, supported by fiction and deceit.

The Marquis de Favras was another unfortunate object of popular fury. It was reported that he had projected the King's escape to Metz, that he had tampered with several of the National Guards for that effect, and had concerted the assassination of the principal men of the new administration. Though no proofs could be brought home to convict him, though the improbability of the facts stared in every man's face, and although he was not even permitted to speak in his own defence, nor to produce any witness, or witnesses in his favor, he was condemned; and put to death. To crown the injustice of this iniquitous procedure, the same person who pronounced sentence of death upon this unfortunate gentleman, added, "Sir, you must consider your life, as a sacrifice due to the peace and tranquility of the public."

The Assembly sat a silent spectator of these acts of injustice. They gave out, seeing that in fact they did nothing for the good of the state, that their beneficent views were obstructed by the continual opposition of the aristocratic party. They paid no attention to the dangerous situation of their King, nor even of the nation, had his Majesty been inclined to oppose force to force, and involve

it in a civil war. Fearless and regardless of all these calamities; heedless of all the consequences which might flow from their inattention, they stopped the operations of the law, annihilated the magistracy, applauded the desertion of the army, and overthrew all the political force of the kingdom, before they had taken a single step to restrain the excesses of the people, or to give them any laws in lieu of those they had abolished. The people therefore turned the tables upon their legislators in many instances, as you will see hereafter.

This charge however affects only some particulars, who, by the aid of the rabble, had got a majority in the Assembly. I speak of a set of men, who pride themselves in particular opinions, opposite to the generally received maxims of the world; of a set of men, who have something to gain, but nothing to lose, and thus look upon the misfortunes of their country as a trivial concern, when ballanced in the scale of their own ambitious and interested views. When I spoke of these leading men as supported by the mob, I should have said that the doors were always thrown open to them, whenever their interference became necessary either to support or oppose a motion, as circumstances

cumstances suited. The reverse is practised in this country. No man is admitted, unless he be introduced by a member; and when any important and weighty debate ensues, the gallery is cleared, and the company desired to retire. I now resume the thread of my story.

M. Mounier, a worthy member of this Assembly (whose name I shall have frequent occasion to mention) had moved for the establishment of two Houses of Parliament, similar to these erected in this country, and that the King should always have a power to dissent, whenever he judged it expedient, against any measure which might be proposed. This motion threw the cabal into a ferment. They threatened those members, who should dare to support it, with their indignation and resentment. They thundered out their rage through all the provinces, whose minds it was necessary to poison, and whose judgments it was their interest to mislead, lest they should be inclined to examine too narrowly into the propriety of their own proceedings. In vain was it urged that in England, the King was vested with this prerogative. In vain did they alledge that this country had two Houses of Parliament, and nevertheless thought itself free,

free. In vain did they contend that when a constitution was well guarded, the Prince could never successfully encroach upon the liberties of the people. Abbé Seyes, among the foremost, replied, "that they did not assemble to copy after others, but to create a new constitution; that it was below the dignity of the French nation to adopt such a patched affair as that of England; that what might suit one country, might not be fitting for another; in fine, that it was perfection alone they sought in the formation of theirs." Thus spoke the patriot. His speech reminds me of Swift's reply to an upstart genius of the same complexion, who took for his motto, *Libertas, et natale vobis*, under which the Dean wrote, "fine words! I wonder where he stole them." I must observe that this Abbé Seyes was one of the most violent opponents of the nobility and superior clergy when their degradation was the subject of debate. But no sooner did the Assembly move for the abolition of tythes, than he was as clamorous in his opposition. *Cicero pro domo sua*. He combated the motion with the most vehement elocution. So true it is, that self-interest is the great and sole spring of most men's actions.

In

In the Assembly at this moment there was nothing but party, faction, and clamour. The most dangerous party, or faction was that which was devoted to the D— of O—. They had openly asserted his claim to the crown in case of failure in the present reigning family. Why was the claim made at this moment? Nobody contested it. Let us however proceed, and by combining circumstances we may be able to form some judgment of the matter. We have already seen that the bloody trophies of a savage mob were suspended before his palace. It is a known fact that he bribed the populace to commit every furious and outrageous act. The public houses were open to them, and he paid for all. "What need have we to work," said one fellow to another, "our good father Philip will support us." It is a well known fact likewise, that his great aim was to drive the King from Versailles, and to get himself declared Regent or Protector. A few more crimes might place him on the throne. But he was incompetent to the business. He had neither the head to plan, or the heart to execute such sublime villany. Our Cromwell he might have possibly taken for his model. But Cromwell's soul was of a different cast. Courage and hypo-

crisy,

crisy, with sanctified and rigid morals, paved the way to his elevation. A disregard of all decency marks the character of the D— of O—. In private life, he is abandoned to the lowest degree of debauchery. I shall however neither put you to the blush, or soil my paper with the recital of these. We will therefore take a view of him in the upper regions of gallantry. Taking a fancy to the wife of M— de S—, he assailed him in a tender part. This gentleman was in distressed circumstances. The D— offered him his purse, provided he would yield the lady to his embraces. The bargain was struck. The D— made her governess to his children, (for he always kept close to the old proverb *utile dulci*;) and she was received into his house, where his Duchefs likewise resided. Thus regardless of common decency due to his wife, to his character, and to the world, he gave to this lady, known by the name of Madame G—, the tuition and management of his children, as I have just said.

It is reported that this woman was the first who impressed him with ideas of his own importance, and insinuated the advantages he might derive from the confusion of the times, if he would but attend to his own interest, summon

summon up a little courage, and untie his purse strings, which in spite of his immense fortune, he had kept carefully closed. Trifling incidents often give birth to the greatest things, particularly where women are concerned. Many instances I could adduce in proof of my assertion, but shall pass them over, rather than give suspicion of offence to the ladies. As to Madame G——, (as she is according to the cant female phrase, a *naughty woman*.) I may take the liberty to censure her; and the more especially as my narrative requires it.

The Queen of France had condescended to make her relation a visit. Madame G—— was in the room, and the lover made her sit down in the presence of his Sovereign. The Queen, as well she might, took offence, and the lady, in consequence of it, was obliged to depart. She vowed revenge however, and what will not a woman do in her resentment? "*Furens quid fœmina possit?*" Like Lady Macbeth she endeavoured to rouse and animate his soul. "Art thou," said she, "afraid to be
"the same in thine own act and valour, as
"thou art in desire? Would'st thou have
"that, which thou esteamest the ornament of
"life, and live a coward in thine own esteem?"

E

Madame

Madame B—— (she was with him in London) he also decoyed from her husband. But as his princely disposition would not suffer him to eat such prime fruit, without paying for it, he offered to M. B—— to procure him superior rank in the army to that he already enjoyed. This was meant as a compensation for the injury and insult offered to that gentleman. What strange ideas of virtue and honor some great men have! But Mr. B—— was too old-fashioned to accept the proffered boon; He replied that “the D—— had conferred already sufficient obligations upon him “by ridding him of a faithless, and consequently of a worthless wife.”

The D——’s courage however did not keep pace with his gallantry. It is a known fact that being in the presence-chamber at Versailles on a certain day, an officer who stood near his person, said, looking him at the same time full in the face, “Ce geux, que fait il icy?” in other words, what does that rascal do here? You may imagine that such a salutation was rather grating to his ears. He therefore withdrew to the opposite side of the room. The officer followed him, and repeated the same offensive words. Upon this the company within hearing began to grin, and he very prudently

denly retired. It was a matter of debate among his party, if he should take notice of the insult. Upon investigating the subject, it was decided in the negative. They not only knew the extent of his courage, but had a greater object in view for him; and to this they bent all their strength.

“He that——and runs away,

“May live to fight another day.”

Though I have impeached both his want of decency and courage, I have as yet paid no tribute to his prudence. This would be acting with a partiality I disdain. Wherefore I beg leave to tell you that on the day he attended the Assembly, when his rights and pretensions to the crown were debated, either through the heat of the place, or the agitation of his mind, he fainted away. Every assistance, you may imagine, was immediately procured. His neck-cloth taken off, his shirt unbuttoned, &c. when to their great surprize they found his body compleatly guarded by a welshed waistcoat, otherwise a coat of mail. What he had to fear, he himself knew best. The precaution however was certainly good, and a full proof of his prudence and sagacity.

It was only in confusion and riot that he could hope to bring his schemes to bear. The

surest method for the purpose, as insinuated to him, was to bring about a real famine, or at least the appearances of it, which would not fail to rouse the mob, as it always serves for a pretext for popular commotions. Though the foregoing harvest had been unproductive, yet by the prudent attention of the magistrates that dreadful calamity had been well guarded against, and it was proved, that Paris had never been more plentifully supplied. This, I say, was proved after the strictest enquiry had been made. It is said that application was made to this country for a supply. It may be so, yet it does not prove that they were in utter distress for that necessary commodity. They might want it, as we did, both for the quality and the quantity, for our harvest was equally bad as theirs; and it is provident to keep up the stock, for fear of a subsequent bad season. But the fact is, *they did not want it*, in any other sense. It was not a want of absolute necessity. I prove it thus. At Lille, for example, there was always a sufficient supply. Bread indeed was a little dearer than usual; and so was our's. If then there was no famine at Lille, there could be none in Paris, and upon that I might rest my argument. But what will not villainy, aided by ingenuity, do? Above two thousand

thousand sacks of flower, it was well known, were thrown into the river Seine at one time. Indeed it was given out, when this infernal transaction was detected, that the corn was damaged, and unfit for use. But, by the most creditable report, it was declared to be the reverse.

Another incident occurred which gave the faction a further opportunity of working upon the passions of the people with the same success. I shall relate it in Mr. Paine's words. "The *Gardes du Corps* (in other words the "King's body-guards) which was composed, "as such regiments generally are, of persons "much connected with the court, gave an entertainment at Versailles (October 1.) to some "foreign regiments, and when the entertainment was at the height, on a signal given, the "*Gardes du Corps* tore the national cockade "from their hats, trampled it under foot, and "replaced it with a counter-cockade prepared "for the purpose." There are a few prominent features in this business, which may lead us to some tolerable knowledge of the truth, obscured as it seems to be by the contradictory assertions of each party. All the troops assembled at Versailles did not amount to ten thousand men. What had Paris, or the faction

tion to fear, who could muster fifty thousand? The entertainment given by the *Garde du Corps* was no novelty. Such entertainments were usually, if not always given, as a compliment, upon the arrival of every regiment. This was given to the regiment of Flanders. The militia-regiments observed the same custom without suspicion of offence. The officers of the *Gardes du Corps*, as well as the other regular troops, had never worn the national cockade, and therefore could not have torn it from their hats to replace it with a counter-cockade, as Mr. Paine asserts. To make any thing of his story, we must suppose that they tore the cockades from the hats of the militia-officers, who were also invited to this entertainment. But would they have patiently suffered such an indignity? Would M. D'Estaing, one of the guests, who commanded that corps, have brooked such pointed insolence? Did he, or did they ever exhibit any complaint of the kind against the *Gardes du Corps*? The Assembly and the faction have been repeatedly called upon to prove the charge. If true, why did not they produce their evidence? What had they to fear? Informers were numerous, cordially received, and deemed a virtuous and deserving people, particularly when they

they impeached any of the royal party. They listened with avidity to the charge brought against the *Gardes du Corps*, which one of the members denounced with all the vehemence of passionate declamation. He demanded justice for the outrages and indignities thrown upon the *august majesty of the nation* by the insult to the patriotic cockade, which they had adopted. A certain M. Pethion, who was present, requested the honorable member to give the charge in writing, and to set his name to it. He hesitated, and seemed confounded. Upon which M. Mirabeau, to relieve his friend from his embarrassment, dexterously turned the discourse. The Committee, who had listened to this charge, perceiving that the tale would not take so well as they had wished, immediately forged another. This was the secret scheme which the *Gardes du Corps* had formed to escort the King to Metz. But in this they were likewise unfortunate, for the pretended discovery of this plot was only made on the 8th of October, and to prevent the execution of it, they seized him at Versailles, and brought him to Paris on the sixth. They attempted, as you will presently see, to massacre the *Gardes du Corps* on the fifth and sixth of October, when their supposed delinquency

quency was only discovered on the eighth day of that month. Indeed some of the newspapers, to palliate the blunder that was made by their associates in iniquity, gave out (for the people will swallow any thing) that the Committee was endowed with the spirit of prophecy. They foresaw what would happen, and therefore by *mere instinct* saved the nation from destruction.

It appears that the Queen was the greatest object of their jealousy. She was supposed to be the adviser of the King in all his measures. She was therefore hated, detested, feared, ridiculed and lampooned. The infamous motion, which M. Mirabeau made in the House, seemed pointedly levelled at her. "I propose, said he, that it be enacted that every individual of this nation, excepting the King, be deemed a subject." M. Mounier, the president, was alarmed, as well as many other members, at this violent motion, which came unexpectedly upon them, and he immediately turned the attention of the House to another object. For had such a decree passed the House, it would not have been deemed unlawful to cut off the Queen or any of the Royal Family, had they thought it necessary for their purposes. The people are apt scholars in all that

that is cruel or mischievous. Mr. Paine allows that they readily take hints from their betters. In confirmation of this point, I must tell you that four assassins, habited like women, stopped on the fatal fifth of October at a public house to drink. One of them addressed his comrades thus. "By G—— I cannot prevail upon myself to kill him. That is not just. But as to her, with all my heart." To which another replied in the true black-guard stile. The "devil take the hindmost, when once we are engaged." Two very creditable witnesses swore to this ruffian discourse, to which however no attention was paid. But to return to the *Gardes du Corps*.

The fact is that the Assembly, or rather the predominant faction in it, was jealous of the attachment which that body of men retained for their King. Their loyalty was a pointed satire and constant reproach to them, as contrasted with their behaviour. Too frequently do men reprobate the actions of those who do right, because they themselves do wrong. However this unfortunate entertainment afforded a pretext for calumny, and calumny soon brought on riot, confusion and bloodshed.

The proscription, and consequently the flight of so many rich and noble families from

the capital, had greatly diminished its trade and commerce. The shops were without customers, and the manufacturers without work. To repair this loss, it was suggested that if the King and Royal Family were compelled to make Paris their residence, the evil under which the people now laboured, would be done away. To forward this scheme, it was industriously reported that the *Gardes du Corps* had it in contemplation to carry the King off to Metz, as I have said, there to erect his standard, summon all his subjects upon their allegiance to attend him, and this to trample upon the liberties of the people. This report has been so confidently asserted, and particularly so by two gentlemen of my acquaintance, who kept up a regular correspondence with Paris, that I have been almost induced to believe it, was not my assent withdrawn for the following considerations.

It was undoubtedly the policy and the drift of the D— of O—— to drive the King from Versailles, because when once his Majesty had deserted his post, the faction would in all probability have declared the throne vacant, and nominated him Regent or Protector of the realm. If such was not his view, wherefore was he so busy on the fifth of October, on that
 very

very day, so disgraceful to the French nation in the eyes of all Europe? His heart, as I have observed, was not formed for the dangers of such a day. Yet he exposed his person in the midst of riot, bloodshed and confusion. Besides, how could the King suppose that a body of 500 men, which was the complement of the *Gardes du Corps* at that moment, could possibly cover his retreat, which was sure to be obstructed by the national militia, and all the armed municipalities, through which he would be obliged to pass? Allowing however that the King had formed the intention of withdrawing himself, in spite of these obstacles, let me ask: Was he not warranted so to do by the alarming temper of the times, and in particular by the indignities which he had so lately received from the Parisians? But to me it appears most probable that he had no such design. He plainly saw through the thin disguise of the D— of O—, and he was resolved to avoid the snare. To his ambitious projects the King was no stranger. He had the fate of our James II. before his eyes. From his false policy, he derived knowledge, and therefore thwarted the borrowed schemes of a second Prince of Orange.

F 2

When

When the decree intituled the *declaration of rights* was presented to the King for his sanction, the Council, which he had summoned upon the occasion, demurred. They halted upon the brink of the precipice, for in fact to assent to this decree, was to exclude himself from all sovereignty. They therefore gave for answer, that his Majesty would soon make his sentiments known. This delay only served to increase the flame, and to accelerate the horrid views of the different parties. The O—— faction, whose industry never slept, turned this irresolution of the King to their own advantage. The most odious comments were made upon it, and these did not fail to have the desired effect, that of raising the mob. Money was thrown among them with a profuse hand; and they in return huzzaed *Philip for ever*. In this motely groupe of impurity were four or five hundred fish-women, who, if possible, were more blasted and depraved than their vile associates. At this moment however M. de la Fayette, the Commandant-General of the militia appeared. The people immediately addressed him in a clamorous manner, and ordered him to repair to Versailles, and compel the King and Royal Family to return to Paris, and in future to make

in their residence. The General* hesitated. He endeavoured to harangue, and appease them, if possible. For only answer, they pointed to the fatal lantern-post, on which so many had already been suspended. Irresolute and fearful what to do (for now the mob gave him the law) he repaired to the Town-house, where a Committee, composed, scarcely of twenty persons, was then sitting. By these, equally terrified with himself, at the insurrection, he was commanded to set off for Versailles, "such being the will of the people." Thus sanctioned by law, he bowed obedience, and soon after set off on his expedition with more than twenty thousand men and thirty pieces of cannon.

Let me here observe that the democratic party in France have affected to compare M. de la Fayette with the American General. I should suppose however that Mr. Washington would not be over proud of the comparison. He, it is true, asserted the liberty of his country, fought for it, and succeeded. But his conduct was never marked with the least duplicity or hypocrisy; never did he submit to be the tool of a lawless rabble. What had

* By the most discerning people, he has been long thought to be an equivocal character.

the

the French General to fear? Was he not at the head of his army? If any miscreant had attempted his life, would not ten thousand arms have been lifted up to ward the blow? Was the corps, which he commanded, so dauntless that they would have suffered their General to be assassinated in their fight? Let the General answer these queries. Either the militia of Paris, which he commanded, was but a gang of cut-throats, which he could not depend upon, or his conduct was cowardly to a degree. Let him now chuse which side of the argument he pleases. His courage indeed, notwithstanding the brilliant panegyric, which Mr. Paine has so liberally bestowed upon him, has not received the same tribute of praise from those who knew him in America. He sent a challenge, it is true, to Lord Carlisle, when he perfectly knew that it would not be accepted, because his Lordship (as he asserted) had spoken disrespectfully of the King of France. What a fund of loyalty at that moment! I suppose he then thought, as the late King of Prussia, who had used to say that the most pleasing dream a Prince could possibly have would be to suppose himself King of France. Was that monarch now alive, would he not exclaim *Quantum mutatus ab illo?*

The

The mob, after having plundered the Town-House, and procured five pieces of cannon, obliged every person they met with on the road to proceed with them to Versailles. This dreadful and motely phalanx, composed of men, women, and men in the disguise of women, all drained from the scum and sinks of Paris, arrived at the place of action about four o'clock in the afternoon. The King was then at Meudon, one of his country-houses, at a small distance from Versailles; for at that alarming period of anarchy and confusion he did not think it advisable to go far from his usual residence, having frequently had ocular demonstration of the use which his good subjects made of the *rights of men*. On the morning he had sent his answer to the *Declaration of Rights*, which I mentioned just before: but as it was not explicit, and consequently not conformable to their expectations, it threw the demagogues into a fury. The most indecent and passionate resolutions were proposed; and, I believe, it was then M. Mirabeau made the motion I have already mentioned, which seemed levelled at the Queen, if not at the royal family in general.

What must have been the feelings of the king on his return, apprized, as he must have been,

been, of the violence of the Assembly, and the appearance of such a tremendous mob, you possibly may better conceive than I am able to describe. The fish-women, in the first instance, repaired to the house where the members were sitting. They were for forcing their way thro' the centinels who guarded the doors, and breaking them open. The Assembly therefore deemed it more prudent to save them that trouble, and ordered the doors to be thrown open. The room, you may imagine, was soon filled by the multitude, who without any ceremony placed themselves promiscuously, or, as we say, cheek by jole with the members. A chief among this black-guard murderous crew began to harangue them. He said that "the good citizens of Paris" came to demand bread, and the immediate "punishment of the *Gardes du Corps* for the "insult offered to the National Cockade." The President endeavoured to soothe and pacify them with mild and soft language, but his voice was quickly drowned by the grinding of the carriage wheels on which the cannon were placed, and which they were going to plant round the house, as also by the incessant roaring and shouting of the mob without doors. Thus we see that the Assembly which
had
had

had made hitherto so free with the royal authority, was in its turn treated with as little respect, and obliged to yield to a vile rabble, headed by a parcel of fish-women. Though many of the members, as not being in the secret, might tremble at this awful appearance of things, yet there were others who beheld the alarming confusion with a steady and serene countenance. Among these were M. Mirabeau, whose lack of courage could only be eclipsed by the D— of O—, who also (as I have remarked) was in the midst of the mob. Mirabeau alone stepped forward, and boldly interrogated the rabble, how they dared to treat the Assembly of the Nation with such indignity and insolence? Instead of resenting this lofty language, as they most assuredly would have done, had any of the royal party dared to harangue them in the same manner, they exhibited no symptom of displeasure. Indeed they could not command their risible muscles with the same facility they did their tongues, for they were seen to grin *horribly* at the farce.

Give me leave to say a few words of this M. Mirabeau. By birth he was a Nobleman, and as such offered his services to that order as one of their representatives in the Assembly. His character being objected to, his

G

services

services were of course rejected. He therefore purchased a hosier's shop, and wrote over the door, *Mirabeau, Dealer in Stockings, Ribbons, &c.* Thus self-degraded, he sunk into the Commons, and procured a seat to represent that body. He was a man of great talents, superior eloquence, and monstrous vices. In fine, he was formed by nature, as Shakespear says, for *treasons, stratagems and spoils*. His patriotism was a farce: for after all his declamation, all his attempts to overthrow the royal authority, he courted its influence; and had it not been for a decree of the Assembly, which declared every member of the legislative body incapable for ever of holding any place, or pension under government, he would have sold himself to the court-party, not doubting but they would purchase his interest at any price. This decree of the Assembly made him, if possible, a greater enemy than ever to the King. Interest alone (for he was a ruined man) being the main spring which gave force and elasticity to all his actions. He is now dead, and peace be to his manes.

Whilst he was haranguing the mob, the *Gardes du Corps* were attacked. They, as well as the regiment of Flanders, were under arms,
but

but had received positive orders not to fire. This proves to demonstration that there were traitors even in the King's Council; for had they been permitted to retaliate, such disciplined troops would have been an over-match for the raw militia, and confused rabble. If they did not mean that they should act, why were they ordered to form? why were they sent upon duty? The King indeed was informed, that if they were suffered to repel force by force, himself, and probably all his family would perish in the conflict. Wherefore these barbarous orders were issued, and to which the *Gardes du Corps* rigidly conformed, and suffered themselves to be insulted, wounded, and even many of them killed, rather than disobey the order. The regiment of Flanders was not so passive. They did not chuse to become victims to such rigid military discipline. They called aloud for orders to fire. These being refused, they tore their cockades from their hats, replaced them with those of the nation, and joined the popular party.

The President of the Assembly, having received his orders from the mob, waited upon the King to lay their grievances before him. His Majesty, as little suspecting as the President, that upwards of thirty waggons laden

with bread, meat, and spirituous liquors, had attended the procession from Paris, or that the famine they complained of was the production of craft and artifice, and not owing to any real deficiency; I say, his Majesty little suspecting all this, most pathetically lamented the miseries of the people. He assured them, through the President, that he would repeat his orders to have the capital well supplied with grain, and that he himself would see that his orders were punctually and immediately executed. The President was also obliged at this moment to present to his Majesty again the *Declaration of Rights*, requesting his assent without any modification or restriction whatever. The King signed it, and thus gave up every thing; for what power can a man be said to have, who is only to execute the will of another? The President has been much censured for his conduct upon this occasion. He protracted however the evil deed as long as he possibly could, for he did not present it to the King till after ten o'clock at night. Moreover, the mob now gave the law, and what could the President do? He supposed his compliance would appease them. The King, as I have already said, assented to the Bill. This was not a time to demur,
much

much less to refuse. The Council indeed sought to protract the business a little, that the Queen and Dauphin might withdraw, and secure themselves from the dangers which surrounded them on all sides. Her Majesty, when she was apprized of their intention, and her immediate departure urged as an absolute necessity, nobly and courageously declared that she would sooner part with her life, than leave the King in the hour of distress, and in the dreadful and alarming situation of the present moment. "As for death," said she, "I fear it not—I have learnt from the Empress, my mother, to value life as nothing, when duty interferes." No intreaties therefore could prevail upon this Princess to depart, although she knew that she was the main object marked for destruction. In this you will find she was not deceived, although preserved from ruffian hands by the special interposition of Providence.

The Gardes du Corps, after having been so mal-treated, were at last ordered to retire from their post. They did so; but were fired at by the militia of Versailles, who killed some of their horses, and wounded several of their men. They proceeded however in tolerably good order, without attempting the least reprisal.

prison. They were then stationed in one of the courts of the palace. All was now uproar and confusion in the extreme. The mob had moved the cannon from the house of the Assembly, and placed it opposite the court where the *Gardes du Corps* were posted. The King, to save them from destruction, and if possible to appease the people, ordered them to retire to Ramboillet, about 30 miles from Versailles, except those who had been wounded, and a few who did duty in various parts of the palace. Alarmed, as well he might be, at the present posture of affairs, he desired the attendance of the Assembly to aid him with their counsels. Before the President appeared, M. de la Fayette arrived at the head of his army. On this sudden turn of affairs, the King, addressing himself to the former, said, "Sir, I wished at this alarming moment to be surrounded by the Representatives of the Nation, and to request their advice. As things are however, I have nothing more to say than that I never had the least intention to go to Metz*." This speech carries with it a great air of mystery. His Majesty seems to have been over-awed by M. de la Fayette.

* In other words, of deserting his post.

However,

However, the Parisian General gave him such assurances of his personal safety, that possibly he might think it useless to advise with the Assembly. Be it as it may, the King was certainly in a lamentable situation. Obligated, as he was, to depend for the security of himself and family upon a man who had erected the standard of rebellion against him; on a man, who was at that moment at the head of a rebel army, and who was, in a manner, the master of himself and his family; on this man, I say, he was obliged to depend for personal safety; at the same time that he was compelled to discard the only faithful servants (the *Gardes du Corps*) who had remained inviolably attached to him. I said above that the conduct of M. de la Fayette appears very mysterious. You will possibly think so likewise, and that his professions of service towards the King and royal family were, if not absolutely insincere, very equivocal, when I come to relate the sequel of this horrid tale.

The President would not suffer the Assembly to adjourn, though pressed to it by several of the members, and particularly by M. Mirabeau, who doubtless (at such a critical moment) had business elsewhere. He very wisely conceived that if he could keep them together,

gether, it might be the means of restraining the excesses of the people, who possibly might retain some little respect for the Representatives of the Nation. But he was mistaken; for the mob roared and thundered in their ears, "Have done with your long speeches—Give us bread." Upon this the President proposed to send to all the bakers for bread, little suspecting that a peculiar providence had already provided for them. In a moment the doors of the Assembly-room were thrown open, the provisions which had been conveyed in the thirty waggons unloaded, and they began to carouze. Thus was the temple of liberty profaned, and became the seat of gluttony and drunkenness.

About three o'clock in the morning, M. de la Fayette quitted the palace, having assured the King that he would answer for the perfect tranquility of every thing. His next step was to propose to the President to adjourn the Assembly, assuring him that he had taken every necessary precaution to keep order. He said that it was high time for all parties to take a little repose after such a day of trouble and confusion; that he himself was so well persuaded that every thing would remain quiet and peaceable, that he was resolved.

ved to go to bed. Upon these positive assurances, M. Mounier, the President, adjourned the Assembly, and appointed the members to meet at eleven o'clock.

These proceedings of the General have undoubtedly a very extraordinary appearance. They prove either his ignorance or his treachery. His ignorance, if he could suppose that such an immense rabble, in a great measure in a state of intoxication, would be guilty of no excess, after the many dreadful instances they had already given of it. If he had foreseen what would happen, (and I believe it will be no rash judgment from the premises to conclude that he did) he acted a most treacherous, infamous, and unworthy part.

Whilst he and the members were consigned to the arms of sleep, or at least when the former was supposed to be so, a detachment of five hundred of the militia presented themselves before the guard-room of the *Gardes du Corps*, in which place there remained only a few of those who had been wounded and disabled in the attack which had been made upon them a few hours before; and for the purposes of duty, as I remarked above, were also left the necessary complement. The officer who commanded at the guard-room, sup-

H

posing

posing that this detachment came with the intention of attacking them again, immediately put himself and his men in a posture of defence, being resolved to sell their lives as dear as possible. The militia perceiving the determined resolution of these brave men, requested a parley. One of them, who spoke in the name of the body, declared that they came with no hostile intentions: all they required were the rights of hospitality, and shelter from the heavy rain, which was then falling. Upon this assurance they were admitted into the guard-room, and treated with the utmost attention and civility. Scarcely however had the day began to dawn, than they seized upon their generous and credulous hosts, and disarmed them. They were then conducted to the parade, where an executioner stood ready for the purpose of sacrificing such objects as were delivered over to him. He was dressed in a most extraordinary manner, and exhibited a very grotesque figure. He had a cap upon his head of an enormous size, with a long beard which hung below his breast; and a tremendous naked axe, which he held in his hand. After having dispatched some of these unfortunate victims, and whilst they were debating in what manner they should

should dispose of the rest, another detachment of these abandoned wretches broke into the courts of the palace, massacred the foremost sentinels, and laying hold of one of them, dragged him under the windows of the King's apartment, and struck off his head. From thence they broke into the apartments of the Queen, after having killed or left for dead the sentinels who did duty there. Their repeated cries of *Madam, Madam, save yourself*, awoke that unfortunate Princess. She had only sufficient time to jump out of bed, and run in that condition into the King's apartment by a back-staircase, another door which led to the long-gallery, which she had tried, being bolted. Such were the precautions of the faction! And indeed it has been whispered abroad, with an air of great probability, that there were some men of better note engaged in this horrid transaction than might have been expected. The Queen had no sooner escaped from this bed of danger, than the assassins broke into the room, and pierced through the bedding with their bayonets in hopes of perpetrating their horrid intentions on that unfortunate Princess: but they were deceived, Providence having procured the means to effect her escape. Furious at their disappoint-

ment, they repaired to the King's apartment: what they proposed to do there, no one can tell; for at that moment M. de la Fayette arrived with a company of the militia-grenadiers.

It may rather surprise you, as it must most people, that the Parisian General, whom it was supposed was safe in bed, if not asleep, should appear at this very critical moment. Ashamed possibly of his scandalous conduct for the last twenty-four hours, and terrified at the dreadful consequences of his own pretended security, he judged it prudent to interpose. In consequence of this, he harangued the people with vehemence and energy. His speech made some impression, and in a few revived the latent sparks of honor and compassion. The King crying aloud for mercy towards the miserable remnant of the *Gardes du Corps*, whom these miscreants were about to dispatch, several of the militia grenadiers hastened to the parade, and rescued those unfortunate victims from their hands. Among these were two officers of rank, whose heads, grown grey with age and long service, they were going to sever from their bodies. Just before the fatal stroke was to be given, they addressed the people in the following manner;

" You

"You may shorten our days, but at least we
 "have this comfortable reflection to support
 "us, that we shall die with our characters un-
 "sullied."

The King appeared soon after at a balcony of the palace, and with him the Queen and children. No sooner did the populace perceive the latter, than they cried out, *No children. No children. The King to Paris.* His Majesty, being now in no condition to refuse, with a good grace promised to comply. He immediately sent for the President of the Assembly, and desired again that the members might attend him, as he wished to advise with them on the present melancholy state of affairs. Several of the members immediately agreed to conform to the King's request; but they were over-ruled by M. Mirabeau, who said that it was below the dignity of the legislative body of the French nation to wait upon the King: besides, should they condescend to do it, their deliberations within the palace-walls might be suspected without doors. All the remonstrances of M. Mounier, the President, to prove the fallacy of M. Mirabeau's arguments were of no avail. It was to no purpose he asserted that the dignity of the Assembly consisted in doing their duty; as such they were indis-

indispensably bound to assist their King under the pressure of such difficulties; that it was ridiculous to suppose that kings, when their palaces were swimming in blood, could be able to controul their deliberations. These and many other arguments, which this good man made use of, though in themselves unanswerable, were nevertheless negatived by the majority.

This, I am convinced, will appear to you one of the most capital faults which the National Assembly has been guilty of. Had they agreed to satisfy his Majesty's request, they would in some measure have wiped off the suspicion which they lay under, of being accomplices in the excesses of the mob, and those of the militia. Possibly, had they done this, people by this time might have forgot that they took no step towards the suppressing these outrages; no measures for preserving peace and order. At last they became conscious of these capital omissions. Their work being compleated, they had leisure for reflection. They became terrified at the increasing outrages of the mob. Fear had seized all their faculties. In a moment they themselves might become victims to the evil spirit which they had conjured up and supported. Even

M. Necker

M. Necker forgot the power, which he once enjoyed over the people. He gave himself up to tears without making the least effort to gain the Parisians, who heretofore looked upon him as their saviour, and the tutelar angel of the nation. This * weakness, or call it what you please, in the Minister, will be for ever thrown in his teeth, as often as ever his name is recorded in history. It is impossible to say that he could have succeeded. Had it been otherwise, at least he would have had the merit of having attempted it. But, as I said, fear and terror had made such impressions on the Assembly, except among the few who were privy to the real secret, that M. Necker

* Another symptom of weakness he exhibited by advising the King to admit a double representation of the people in the Assembly. He soon however perceived his mistake, and wished in some measure to remedy what was now past a cure; for the people, having got all the power in their own hands, were not so ready to surrender it. In hopes however of applying a remedy, he silently sided with those who voted for the prerogative in the King, to assent or dissent to any bill which passed the House. But when he found the motion so unpopular, courtier like, he suffered himself to be carried down the stream. This accident (among others) proves that M. Necker never meant to carry things to the shameful pitch they are now arrived at.

is not more culpable than the rest for having yielded to them.

Every thing being now prepared for his Majesty's departure from Versailles to Paris, it was decided that the said bloody characters, which hitherto had marked the triumphant prowess of the people over their king, should be displayed in the mournful procession, which was now going to take place. On each side of the King's coach were marshalled the remnant of his *Gardes du Corps*. Without arms, their hair dishevelled, covered with dust, sweat, and wounds; fainting under the fatigues and apprehensions of the preceding conflict, they were ordered to march on foot. Before the carriage were carried upon long poles two of the heads of their unfortunate comrades, preceded by the executioner, above mentioned, smeared all over his face, breast, and hands with human gore. The Queen was in a separate carriage. I only mention this to say that the mob had stopped it several times; opened the doors, and insulted her in the grossest manner. An immense mob, as you may imagine, attended this woeful procession of degraded majesty, huzzaing and roaring like the war-hoop of the wild Indians; and that the whole might be as galling and mortifying as possible

possible to the unfortunate objects of their proud exultation, it moved with a most solemn pace. The rear was brought up by the cannon, and thus it paraded to Paris. It may be remarked that the order of this dismal procession was planned by no ordinary head. There was too much regularity in it, if I may use that word, to have been the effect of chance, or even to have been projected in haste. Posterity undoubtedly, as well as the present generation, will be as much surprised when they reflect that these horrid scenes were exhibited by a nation, which has always been deemed polite, humane, and inviolably attached to their Sovereigns; by a people who have been always so infatuated with their own consequence and superior merit, as to deem the rest of the world (like the ancient Romans) barbarous. *Barbare* was too frequently used heretofore by most Frenchmen as a word of contempt, when they spoke of foreigners, I leave you now to judge where the epithet might be most properly applied at this moment.

Permit me to repeat what I remarked before. There were several parties or factions in the Assembly. You have observed the end which the D—— of O—— proposed to him-
 I self

self by conjuring up this last storm. But success did not attend the project. It is more than possible M. de La Fayette might fear he would prove successful, and thus may be explained, the sudden appearance of the Parisian general, when the assassins broke into the palace. He had reserved to himself the honor of making the King a prisoner, and therefore prevented the execution of a similar scheme which the Marquis de St. Hereaguer had attempted some time before, as I have already noticed.

The D—— of O—— was now in a very critical situation, for M. de la Fayette was privy to his projects, and might impeach to make some amends for his own evil deeds. Wherefore the King, to save his relation from the consequences of an inquiry into his conduct, obtained a pass-port of the National Assembly; and under pretence of a special commission to the Court of London, rescued him from disgrace. Here he remained, till by his pecuniary sacrifices and base submissions he bought his peace of the Assembly, and was permitted to return. *

No

* It has been far from my intention to calumniate this great personage, if such I may call him. His character

is

No sooner did the King reach Paris, than the famine ceased. This appeared so evident, that the people jestingly said that they had brought the baker, his wife, and apprentice into the city, meaning the King, Queen, and the Dauphin. This vile scheme having had its due effect, the imposition was no longer necessary. The next object of their care was to preserve that authority which they had usurped, for now the *vessel of state* was sailing with more rapidity than ever, as they asserted. The provinces however might rebel, and call them to an account for their conduct towards the King. Other powers might arm in defence of injured and degraded majesty. They might make it a common cause, and thus would the faction lose the fruits of their labours. However they had the King in their hands, and he would serve as a compleat barrier, or rather a hostage against all attempts both within and without. It has always been the policy of insurgents, and in particular of the French nation, to secure their King for that very same purpose. The Hugonets attempted it at
 is so well known, and the transactions, which I have noticed, are positively asserted by numberless writers, uncontradicted by any, that the tale can only be novel to those who have been ignorant of the events.

Amboise upon Francis II. and at Méaux upon Charles IX. These however did not succeed so well as the present faction have done, who, to make the best of their miserable hostage, forced him to declare that he went to reside in Paris of his *own accord*; that being *free* to go where ever he pleased, he had *chosen* that city for the place of his residence. Who could reproach them after such a declaration? Did he not declare that he went to Paris of his own *free will*? Did they not, in conjunction with the Monarch, labour for the good of the nation? Did he not assent *freely* to their decrees, seeing that he himself was *free*? It however may be asked, *en passant*, if he was *free to go wherever he pleased*, how they came lately to stop him, as he was going to St. Cloud for the benefit of a little country air? How it happened that they forced him to return to his residence, I had almost said to his prison, in Paris? I now proceed. This sophistry of the faction threw dust in the eyes of the people. It was all they wanted; for what is a king without them? It precluded all reflection, and left them in the peaceable enjoyment of their usurpation. Another motive likewise contributed towards it. If any attempt was made for his emancipation, he
would

would undoubtedly have been the victim of it. It must have created in some degree a civil war, which the faction would no doubt have imputed to his intrigues; and, like our Charles I. have made him answerable for. Among many other reasons for my assertion, I shall trouble you only with the following. It was debated at the club of the *Jacobins*, which is known greatly to influence, if not totally to give the law to the Assembly, *whether a king is amenable to public * justice?* Soon after which, a Member of the National Assembly, commenting largely upon the unfortunate catastrophe of King Charles I. Another member (Mr. Brissot) among many other violent remarks, replied that "the English Parliament shewed itself guided by the true spirit of patriotism when it abolished a tyrannical monarch. He deserved the most rigorous punishment, and brought down upon his devoted head, the just vengeance of earth and heaven." (inserted in the *Argus* Nov. 3. 1790.) As I said, this consideration must hitherto have prevented attempts to rescue the king and the nation from thralldom. It is impossible, upon any other grounds, to account

* If I recollect right, it was carried in the affirmative.

for the inactivity of so many princes of the blood, of so many of the first and noblest families of France, who have been deprived of their honors, dignities, and patrimony, and forced into a kind of voluntary exile. It is an example without precedent.

Here I might dismiss the subject, did I not wish to make a few remarks concerning their treatment of the clergy, whom by a species of contradiction, they have excluded from the *rights of men*. The national debt, and the want of credit, added to M. Necker's declaration that he could not make good his engagements for the liquidation of it, were the specious causes of their ruin. The Archbishop of Aix, in the name of the clergy, offered four hundred, and afterwards six hundred millions of livres for the purpose. It was of no avail. Why? because there is not a doubt but a great party, if not the greatest, wished to abolish all * religion from the land, and nothing could do it more efficaciously than the degradation and annihilation of the clergy.

* Wise legislatures! Plutarch will tell them "that a city might sooner be built without any ground to fix it upon, than a commonwealth be constituted without religion."

Where

When a motion was made, whether the ancient religion should be the one established by law, it was only to feel the pulse of the nation, and try if they could be prevailed upon to discard it totally. The mode of religion to the Assembly in general was very indifferent. The publications of Voltaire, Rousseau, Abbé Raynal, &c. &c. which Mr. Paine so much extols and recommends, overturned every idea of it, as well as of regal government. Those who are conversant in their works will not hesitate to pronounce that from these sources they learnt to despise their religion, their king, the clergy, and whatever was heretofore deemed sacred honorable and useful.

The decree, declaring the property of the church to be that of the nation, having passed, thousands of both sexes have been, in consequence of it, stripped of a comfortable maintenance, and in a manner sent a begging, or obliged to live upon a precarious subsistence. To undermine religion more efficaciously, an oath was framed in such equivocal and ambiguous terms as was sure to be refused by every man of sentiment and integrity. Thus, out of one hundred and thirty-one of the episcopal

pal order, only four have taken it. This is a state trick of state policy, which has been practised with more success than honesty in other countries besides France. But to return. If so many of the episcopal order, as I said, have refused this oath, how much greater must the number be among the inferior clergy? In fact so few have taken it, that they are obliged to accept of whatever they can get, and ordain and admit such as are neither qualified by their education or morals for those functions. But the people will have some show of religion, * and to this the demagogues, in spite of the lessons they have culled from the works of Voltaire and other philosophers, are obliged to conform. They are certainly very miserable politicians that can suppose a state may subsist without it. It is in direct opposition to experience, and never was supposed by any legislator whatever, before the present moment.

The impolitic and unjust measure, which they have adopted, of depriving the church of its patrimony, cannot be more amply ascer-

* No nation under the sun exists without some show of religion. It is as appropriate to their nature as to eat, drink, or sleep.

tained than by precedent. This they had before their eyes, and might have profited of the mistakes of others, had equity and the welfare of their country been the objects of their views. Many of the best men in this country (Protestants) have lamented the dissolution of religious houses throughout this island. What will become of the poor in France? Let Mr. Collier answer. "The abbeyes suppressed in England and Wales, says he, were six hundred and forty-five, as Camden reports. The yearly revenue is computed at £. 135,522:18:10. — While the religious houses were standing, there were no provisions for the poor. No assessment upon the parish for that purpose. But now this charge upon the kingdom (observe he wrote in Queen Anne's reign) amounts at a modest computation to 800,000*l. per annum.*" Now give me leave to remark that if we compute the annual income of £. 135,522:18:10 with the poor's tax, even of his time, it will appear what the nation has lost by the dissolution. Consideration nevertheless is to be had to the different valuation of money in those days and these; but this makes no difference in the nature of the burthen, which the present possessors of the abbey-lands would find, if the whole

K

charge

charge of the poor was to be thrown upon them. It is allowed, the nation is grown more populous, and by this the number of the poor are proportionally increased; but are not the riches and trade of the nation increased in the same degree? Now it is somewhat mysterious, how a nation that increases in wealth should abound with more beggars, unless sacrilege has *entailed* that curse upon them.

But what would Mr. Collier say, if he was now living, to the poor's tax of the present day? What would his astonishment be, when informed that it is tantamount to, if it does not exceed the yearly revenues of the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark? And yet, to the disgrace of the nation, the towns and country are over-run with beggars, and the poor are still increasing every day.

What compensation will the National Assembly be able to make "for the advantages, which they have now lost, received from the religious houses, which were considerable upon several accounts. To mention some of them. The temporal nobility and gentry had a creditable way of providing for their younger children: Those who were disposed to withdraw from the world, or not likely to make their

" their fortune in it, had a handsome retreat
 " in the cloister. Here they were furnished
 " with conveniences for life and study, with
 " opportunities for thought and recollection,
 " and over and above passed their time in a
 " condition not unbecoming their quality."

Give me leave to add that young ladies of small
 fortunes, and old who were doomed to a life
 of celibacy have frequently experienced
 the propriety of Mr. Collier's remarks. They
 had a comfortable and genteel retreat, which
 they have now lost. Another writer, no ways
 prejudiced in favor of the religion professed in
 the convents, thinks that " to the want of such
 " retreats in a great measure are to be ascri-
 " bed the several inconveniences we lie under
 " at this day; especially since the frequent
 " marriages of the meaner and indigent clergy,
 " who having no temporal estates to support
 " their families after their death, leave their
 " wives and daughters destitute and necessi-
 " tous, who being too proud, or too lazy to
 " work, often take ill courses to subsist; all
 " which might be prevented, if there were
 " places to receive and support them in a vir-
 " tuous and comfortable way of life. From
 " this defect results the lewdness of these aban-
 " doned times, more than from any viciousness

" in the temper or constitution of the English,
 " since we seldom find these disorders in wo-
 " men of birth, fortune and education; while
 " others in ill circumstances generally sacrifice
 " themselves to their vanity and necessities;
 " &c." (Higgin's Short View of the Hist. of
 England, Reign of Henry VIII.

" The abbeyes, says Mr. Collier, were very
 " serviceable places for the education of
 " young people, who were taught without any
 " charge to their parents. And in the nunne-
 " ries those of the other sex learnt to work,
 " &c." He then proceeds to tell his readers,
 that it is to the abbeyes we are obliged for most
 of our historians " of church and state." Will
 not this apply equally to the abbeyes in France?
 Where has there been a more learned, and con-
 sequently a more useful body, than the con-
 gregation of St. Maurs? " Besides this rent-
 " charge (the poor's tax, which Mr. Collier
 " has been speaking of) the nobility suffered
 " considerably." He then enumerates their
 losses upon the dissolution, and says " The

† I might have mentioned the Jesuits, who have ex-
 celled in every branch of literature. They taught youth
gratis; and instilled into their pupils the love of virtue
 and rational subordination. Had their order not been a-
 bolished, the revolution, such as it is in France, would
 never have had an existence.

" founders

"founders had the benefit of *corrodies*, that is,
 "they had the privilege of quartering a cer-
 "tain number of poor servants upon the ab-
 "beys. Thus people that were worn out
 "with age and labour, and in no condition to
 "support themselves, were not thrown up to
 "starving, or parish collections, but had a com-
 "fortable retreat to the abbeys, where they
 "were maintained without hardship, or marks
 "of indigence, during life.

Let us now see what these historians say
 respecting the injustice of the dissolution, and
 the means which were taken to effect it, both
 of which equally apply to France at the pre-
 sent moment. "The rights and liberties of
 "the Church, says Mr. Collier, had been con-
 "firmed in thirty parliaments. They stand
 "in the front of *Magna Charta*. The endow-
 "ments of the Church were settled upon im-
 "portant considerations. For the honor of
 "God, the advancement of learning, for the
 "interests of eternity.—It is said that the
 "monasteries were of royal * foundation, and
 "therefore the taking them away, was only a
 "resumption of grants from the crown. Tho.

* Therefore "what the state had given, the state might
 take away." See Lord Robert Fitzgerald's Speech,
 page —.

" assertion

"assertion is wide of truth, as many of the
 "abbeys, &c. were founded by bishops and
 "temporal lords, and some by gentry of lesser
 "quality. Besides all the estates in the king-
 "dom were grants from the crown, as appears
 "from the tenures: and it would have been
 "looked upon as an arbitrary attempt to have
 "taken them away. For a gift is a transla-
 "tion of right, extinguishes the title of the
 "donor, and vests the property in another.
 "But this alienation was made by act of par-
 "liament; (or, let me add, by a decree of the
 "National Assembly) That is true; and there-
 "fore it was a legal ousting. But then it will
 "be asked, if a great part of the temporal lords
 "and other rich laity had been thrown out of
 "their estates by a statute, whether such pro-
 "ceedings would not have been thought an
 "instance of rigour, and mysterious authority?
 "Had they been thus impoverished without
 "treason or felony to deserve it, it may be the
 "legality of the form, and the pleasure of the
 "legislators, would hardly reconcile them to
 "such usage.—It would be very much a que-
 "stion whether the heirs of the abbey-lands
 "would be so compliant with the crown, and
 "part so easily with their money, as the monks
 "had done.—Such an experiment upon men
 " of

"of title and interest, of steel and stomach
 "might prove dangerous in the operation.—
 "When the Emperor Charles V. heard of the
 "fate of the English abbeys, he is reported to
 "have said, that now the King had killed the
 "hen, which laid golden eggs." In fact, what
 immense sums have not the French clergy at
 times raised for the benefit of the state? And
 what an enormous sum did not they offer (six
 hundred millions of livres) at this present mo-
 ment? This resource, which is now lost, might
 have been of use at a future day. The ab-
 beys must be rich, as they always live so much
 within the income of their revenues*.

To effect a dissolution of these religious
 establishments in France, they were obliged to
 have recourse to the same vile means, which
 were practised in this country.

Mr. Thomas Hearne, in his preliminary
 observations upon Mr. Browne Willis's view
 of the mitred abbeys, says that Henry VIII.

* The best stated fact I can produce of the contribu-
 tions of the French clergy to the state is from the year
 1734 to 1755. During this period they gratuitously gave
 to the King eighty-one millions of livres. The taxes they
 paid were likewise enormous. It is true, they were ob-
 liged to borrow the money for these gratuitous donations,
 which their economy however enabled them to be paying
 off yearly.

and

and his courtiers to gain their ends "passed
 "by no arts or contrivances that might pos-
 "sibly be of use in obtaining them. The
 "most abominable crimes were to be charged
 "upon the religious, and the charge was to be
 "managed with the utmost industry, boldness
 "and dexterity. This was a powerful argu-
 "ment to draw an odium upon them, and to
 "make them * disrespected, and ridiculed by
 "the generality of mankind." Has not this
 been done in France? Consult the works of
 Voltaire, &c. Infomuch that for these few
 years past a religious man has not been able
 to walk the streets without being insulted.
 But to proceed with Mr. Hearne. "Yet after
 "all, the *proofs were so insufficient*, that by what
 "I have been able to gather, I have not found
 "one direct charge proved, not even against
 "any single monastery."

"But, says Mr. Collier, granting that the
 "lives of the religious were not so strict as
 "they ought to have been, it would have been
 "no sufficient reason to seize their estates. If
 "insobriety and misbehaviour were sufficient
 "grounds for forfeiture; if ill-living, and not

* For this purpose was the play of Charles IX. then
 written, and acted in Paris. For this purpose was *an auto*
da fe exhibited in their theatre.

" answering

" answering the ends of an estate would justifi-
 " fy the dispossessing the owner, property would
 " be very precarious, and tenures slenderly
 " guarded.—Acts of Parliament have without
 " question authority to over-rule claims, ex-
 " tinguish titles, and govern the courts of ju-
 " stice. But are there not some things above
 " the reach of the legislature? Can a statute
 " unconsecrate a church, enact a sunday no ho-
 " liday, or sacrilege no sin? Is not almighty
 " God capable of property? If we must an-
 " swer in the affirmative; how can an estate
 " dedicated to his service, and vested in him,
 " be taken away without his consent? Which
 " way can the intention of the donor, and the
 " main design of the conveyance be over-
 " looked, and defeated?

How the spoils of the religious houses will
 be applied in France time alone can show.
 But as the same causes have generally the same
 effects, we may make a shrewd guess from pre-
 cedents also. Permit me to transcribe a few
 lines from Sir William Dugdale upon the sub-
 ject; " All the fruit the people reaped, after
 " all their hopes built upon these specious
 " pretences, (*viz.* as in France, by relieving
 " the people from the oppressive taxes) was
 " very little. For it is plain that subsidies
 " from the (remaining) clergy, and fifteenth

" of lay-men's goods were soon after exacted:
 " and that in King Edw. VIth's time the Com-
 " mons were constrained to supply the King's
 " wants by a new invention, viz. sheep, cloaths,
 " goods, debts, &c. for three years, which tax
 " being so heavy, that the year following they
 " prayed the King for a mitigation thereof."
 Camden says " Notwithstanding the immense
 " spoils of the abbeyes, King Henry VIII. was
 " reduced to such poverty that (to the utter
 " ruin of commerce in this nation) he had
 " corrupted the sterling, or *Easterling* coin,
 " which King Richard II. had declared to be
 " the only lawful money of the kingdom."
 And so much was it debased, that the effigy
 of the beautiful King Henry appeared on the
 testons with a red copper nose. And had he
 lived a little longer, a project was made to
 coin leather money.

In the former transactions of this country,
 relative to this subject, we may in a great mea-
 sure estimate the present proceedings in France.
 The same causes, as I said, will generally pro-
 duce the same effects. " Abbey-lands, says
 " Fuller, in his Church history, as the dust
 " flung up by Moses, presently disperse all the
 " kingdom over, and at once become curses
 " both on the families and estates of the own-
 " ers—for within twenty years next to the
 " dissolution

" dissolution more of the nobility, and their
 " children, have been attainted, and died un-
 " der the sword of justice, than did from the
 " conquest to the dissolution, being almost
 " 500 years." If a counter-revolution should
 be attempted in France (a thing not at all
 impossible) some future historian may make
 the same melancholy remark on that coun-
 try.

The facts, relative to the Revolution in
 France, I have collected from a variety of
 French pamphlets written on the subject by
 parties on both sides of the question. When
 I found any of them positively asserted by
 one set of men, and not contradicted by the
 other, or palliated in such a manner as to be
 tantamount to a concession, I thought I might
 venture to state them as facts: I vouch for
 their authenticity no farther*. If I have
 arraigned their proceedings with freedom, it
 was their proceedings only I meant to cen-
 sure, and not their attempts for liberty. I

* If it be asked, if men can be guilty of such facts as
 I have related? let them read the works of the modern
 philosophers, and give the answer. The majority in the
 Assembly are professedly the disciples of these philoso-
 phers. They are now, and indeed have been paying al-
 most divine honours to them. According to the old pro-
 verb, "Tell me what company you keep, and I will tell
 " you what you are."

with it sincerely to all the children of Adam. I know the full value of it, having the happiness to enjoy a portion of it myself. But it is rational liberty I contend for, such as is consistent with the peace and welfare of society. Every man, says Mr. Paine, has undoubted natural rights; but he justly adds, those rights do not warrant him to encroach upon those of his neighbour. I most cordially wish that the succeeding generation in France may in some measure atone by their good deeds for the mistakes of the present day; and as fermenting liquors by degrees work off their secularity, such a reformation both in church and state may take place, as will redound to the glory of God, and the happiness of the people. There were undoubtedly very great acts of cruelty and injustice committed in this nation, both at the Reformation, and at the * Revolution in 1688; but these are almost forgotten by the peace and happiness we now enjoy.

I am very well convinced therefore that the argument may be retorted upon me, nevertheless I shall take the liberty to censure what appears to be censurable. It was the fate of Lord Robert Fitzgerald, which however has not in the least detracted from his merit in

* Witness the many innocent persons who suffered for Oat's plot and others; all tending to promote the same end,
humanely

humanely and benevolently standing forth in defence of the Irish and Scotch colleges in France, which lay under the general proscription. "The ground which Lord Robert Fitzgerald took, say our newspapers, for this exemption was, that whatever property those colleges possessed in France, it had been all purchased with money carried from Ireland and Scotland; that the endowments of those colleges not having been French, but British from the beginning, the principle that what the state had given, the state could take, could not attach upon them; or if it did, it was only to show that the state could not in justice take those endowments for the best of all reasons, because it was not from the bounty of France that they were held; on the contrary, a valuable consideration had been given for them, and the amount of it was paid with British money."

"One member just observed upon it, that the present era was fertile in revolutions, as astonishing as they were new. He said it was not more surprising to see a National Assembly sitting amidst the ruins of despotism, in the capital of France, giving laws to the kingdom, than to see the Minister of a Protestant King pleading the cause of the catholic subjects of that monarch, whom

"whom the intolerant spirit of penal laws had
 "forced to become refugees in a foreign
 "land; and who would instantly cease to be re-
 "fugees, if their own government would cease
 "to be intolerant. To refuse them protection
 "at home, and afford it to them in a foreign
 "state, was a phenomenon both in politics
 "and common sense. The step taken by
 "Lord Robert Fitzgerald seemed to be the
 "consequence of a struggle between absurd
 "policy on the one hand, and wisdom on the
 "other; and he rejoiced that the latter had
 "triumphed; but he remarked, however,
 "that its triumph could not be complete till
 "England should have learned to treat all its
 "inhabitants as subjects, and not force any of
 "them to seek abroad for that protection,
 "which penal laws, attaching not upon crimes,
 "but upon conscience, do not suffer them to
 "find at home."

I begin to fear that I have now tired you
 with this long letter; too short however it
 certainly is for the magnitude of the subject,
 which possibly may give you as much pain to
 read, as it has to me to relate. The history
 of nations, Voltaire very justly observes, is
 but a recapitulation and a memorial of their
 crimes. A most melancholy reflection! To
 release you therefore from this painful sub-
 ject,

ject, I shall only add that if the King attempts an escape (which I think very probable, if he can do it), it will prove to demonstration the ill treatment he has received, and the danger to which his life is exposed. No other motive, but that of self-preservation, would tempt him to quit his present residence, and risk his crown, even such as it is in its present state of debasement.

As to the oath which he has taken to preserve the constitution as by law established, it never can be deemed binding, because he was not free * when they forced it upon him. He had

* He was then, as he is still, a prisoner. Had the faction thought the oath binding, why did they deprive him of his liberty?—The following extract from Judge Blackstone will set this matter in a clear light: “An involuntary act,” says he, “as it has no claim to merit, so neither can it induce any guilt; the concurrence of the will, when it has its choice either to do or avoid the fact in question, being the only thing that renders human actions either praise-worthy or culpable. Indeed, to make a compleat crime cognizable by human laws, there must be both a will and an act; to constitute a crime against human laws there must be first a vicious will, &c. One case in which the will does not join with the act, is where the action is constrained by some outward force and violence. Here the will counteracts the deed, and is so far from concurring with, that it loaths and disagrees to what the man is obliged to perform.”

had no alternative. Life, though chequered with so many evils, is sweet; and the anxious concerns for a family make most men pause, when they stand upon the brink of eternity. Lewis XVI. therefore preferred the poisoned cup of life to the sword of the assassin, or the mockery of a judicial (though not unprecedented) trial. His hard fate (for of most of his predecessors he deserved it the least) may prove an awful lesson to all the Kings of the earth. That they may amply profit by it, both for their own sake, and the peace and happiness of their subjects, is the cordial wish and ardent prayer of,

Dear SIR,

Your ever obliged,

and most humble Servant,

June 7th, 1791.

form. One species of defect of will is that arising from
 "compulsion and inevitable necessity.—There a constraint
 upon the will whereby a man is urged to do that which
 his judgment disapproves; and which, it is to be pre-
 sumed, his will (if left to itself) would reject. As pu-
 nishments are therefore only inflicted for the abuse of
 that free-will which God has given to men, it is highly
 just and equitable that a man should be excused for
 those acts which are done through unavoidable force
 and compulsion."



